

Free-Soilers are concerned; and only Scott is left. What of him? He seems as yet to stand in a doubtful position; or rather, his friends wish to make that position appear doubtful. We think, however, so far as the compromise measures are concerned, there is little doubt. Southern politicians almost universally concede that he is not in favor of those measures; but they claim more of him—they claim that before they will give him their support he must come out openly and avowedly on their side. This he will probably refuse to do, and consequently will receive their united opposition. But will he show his hand, so that the friends of liberty at the North can have confidence in him? This is not at all likely, for two reasons: first, because, so far as we have the means of judging, his inclinations are all the other way; and second, because if he should, it would kill the long lingering prospect he may have in the Whig party for a nomination.

We conclude, then, that neither of the two leading parties will present a candidate that free-Soilers can support. What shall they do? This is an important question. We are glad to know that the Free Soil party is not disbanded—that it has a National Committee, and that Committee has determined to call a Convention to nominate candidates if necessary. We rejoice at this, because we expect that thousands, and perhaps hundreds of thousands of voters will have no party candidates that they can conscientiously vote for, unless the Free Soil party presents such candidates. We think, then, that the duty of those who place conscience above party organization is plain. It is, to be governed by high moral principles in their political action—to vote for no man who will give his personal and official influence to advance those public measures which they consider paramount to all others; and if no party presents such candidates, then to vote for candidates of their own nomination. There are probably hundreds of thousands of voters who make the slavery issue paramount to all others. Shall they vote for men who go diametrically opposite to their principles on this question? We are sure that those who believe the voter should require his candidate to agree with him on all questions; but he certainly should require such agreement on the main question; and especially so if the main question is more important than all others put together. Whatever course parties may take, we are confident there is a great work for the voters to do who are governed by high and immutable principle in their political conduct. Let them be true to their trust.

From the Green Mountain (Vt.) Freeman.

APATHY OF FREE-SOILERS.

Many leading men of the old parties have with an air of triumph asserted within our hearing, during the last six months, that "the Free Soil party was now a dead concern;" that "the spirit which once animated it in opposition to slavery and its aggressions was obviously gone, and that a great majority of its members were evidently sick of the subject, and were waiting for a decent opportunity to abandon the cause altogether." Free-Soilers and Anti-slavery men, what say you to such charges? Do you deny the important motto which we do? Will you doubtless be your response: "As we are firm in our principles as ever." As a general thing, we believe you; but are you not, by your apathy, these days giving your opponents too much cause for their disparaging imputations? We greatly fear so; but from what cause can such apathy proceed? Are the great principles of freedom and right less important now than formerly? Is the declaration of independence, alike the foundation of our true national platform, and the Government under which we live, less sacred and obligatory? Are its principles less violated, and the rights it secures less endangered? Is the Proviso, or Jefferson Ordinance, less loudly demanded? Is the slave power weaker, or its aggressions less alarming? Is our Government less perverted by its influence? Is the commercial capital and less used in its widely extended machinations? No; a thousand times no! The great principles of freedom and right are the same, because founded on the rock of eternal justice, and their splendor and glory are more glorious and striking in the light of the day than the minions of slavery have to eclipse them. The Declaration of Independence still stands the admitted creed of the nation, and its principles guaranteed by the Constitution are as obligatory as the solemn oaths we have taken to support it can make them; while the great principles of both those instruments have been violated during the two past years with a boldness and extent that mark the period as an era of national corruption and disgrace. If the adoption of the Jefferson Ordinance was called for in 1848, as the great masses of the North almost unanimously conceded, it is a hundred fold more demanded now, when nearly every square mile of all the territory acquired from Mexico is being peopled with slaves. If the slave power was then deemed strong, and its aggressions alarming, what should be its position now, when what was comparatively but a rivulet has swelled to a dark and turbid river, threatening to inundate the whole land, and overthrow the very citadel itself of American freedom? If our Government was then thought too subservient to the slave power, how should it be looked upon now, when its almost undivided energies are seen employed in strengthening that power, and helping to establish its complete ascendancy over both our National and State Institutions? Nor is this all; the slave power and the Governmental power have conspired to enlist a third—the commercial and money power of the North—which, neutral then, is fast becoming more difficult to contend with successfully than either the others, or perhaps both combined.

If all this be so, have Free-Soilers nothing to do? Is not the voice of the people, as the great motto sentiment became a duty involving public action now? Have their duties to support the Constitution no connection with their duty of public action under such circumstances? Ponder it, freemen of the North—make it the subject of your pillow reflections, and decide for yourselves whether apathy and indifference can be longer indulged in, even to say nothing of the wrongs of slavery consistent with your love of a free Government, and your avowed duty to maintain it; and whether, finally, you can be longer inactive and be held guilty at the bar of conscience, or escape the curses of your posterity, for what may be forever lost through your apathy and lack of exertion.

CALL FOR AN ANTI-SLAVERY CHRISTIAN CONVENTION.

Christianity is the remedy provided by God for all the wants of the world—political, social, and spiritual! The church of Jesus Christ is the divinely appointed agency to apply this remedy. This she does by preaching the truth, and by the consistent holy lives of her members.

When the church becomes remiss in duty, and ceases to bear a decided testimony against every form of sin, the effect upon the world soon becomes apparent.

That this is the case, so far as regards the larger popular organizations of the land, is but too manifest. There is not only a great want of pointedness in their testimony against the great sins of the country, but to an alarm extent a direct participation in and advocacy of these wrongs. This is especially true of the sin of slavery.

Believing that Christians are called upon to put forth a special effort to stay the tide of pro-slavery and other corrupting influences that seem to be despoiling the popular churches of the land, and sweeping away the very foundations of morality, it is now proposed to hold an Anti-Slavery Christian Convention in Cambridge, on the first Tuesday of May, at 3 o'clock P. M.

The object of the Convention is to devise the best means of reviving the moral power of the church to bear in the overthrow of the strong holds of sin, and the dissemination of a pure Gospel.

The call is extended to all the Ministers and members of all evangelical churches, not engaged in the practice of slaveholding.

Ministers.

THOMAS BROWN, ANDREW BLACK, WM. WILSON, JAMES R. DODD, GEO. RICHARD, LUCY DEWITT, THOMAS M. FINEY, J. S. POAGE, THOMAS MERRILL, and many others.

P. S. Free Presbyterians and other papers friendly, please copy.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, APRIL 1, 1852.

Subscribers who do not file the *Era*, and have numbers 261, 262, 264, and 265, on hand, will confer a favor by remitting them to this office, at our expense.

OLE BULL.—Of the Concert given by this wonderful performer, our friend, Grace Greenwood, discourses at large in her letter.

UNCLE TOM'S CABIN.

Mrs. Stowe has at last brought her great work to a close. The last chapters appear in this week's *Era*. With our consent, the Boston publishers issued an edition of five thousand on the 20th of March, but it has already been exhausted, and another edition of five thousand has appeared.

We do not recollect any production of an American writer that has excited more profound and general interest. Since the commencement of its publication in our columns, we have received literally thousands of testimonials from our renewing subscribers, to its unsurpassed ability.

We hope that this grand work of fiction may be the last service to be rendered by Mrs. Stowe to the cause of Freedom, through the columns of the *National Era*.

Copies of this work are for sale at this office. Price, in paper covers, \$1; cloth, \$1.50; cloth, full gilt, \$2.

Persons at a distance of not over 500 miles can have this work mailed to them, free of postage, on addressing L. Clephane, at this office, and enclosing \$1 in money and 24 cents in post office stamps; over 500 miles, the postage will be forty-eight cents.

A NEW WORK.

We shall soon commence the publication of a new novel, from the German of Jeanne Marie, entitled, Rank and Nobility, translated for the *National Era* by Dr. ATLEE, of Philadelphia, whose death is just announced in the papers of that city. Dr. Atlee was an excellent scholar, a man of pure taste, sound principles, and large benevolence. The translation announced is his last literary labor, and the work is one full of rich and varied interest, and abounding in the noblest truth. It will probably run through twelve or thirteen numbers of the *Era*.

Beside this, we have on hand several other contributions of great value, which will appear as fast as we can make room for them.

THE POSITION AND PROSPECTS OF THE WHIG PARTY.

The time for the National Whig Convention is not yet fixed. Some doubt whether such a Convention will be held at all; but we do not agree with them. Politicians at Washington may hesitate; the party is decided. Many State Conventions have already appointed delegates, and the Whig Press seems unanimous.

As to the candidates, there is less trouble from personal preferences than we find among Democrats. Only three are mentioned—Fillmore, Scott, and Webster, and their friends, are severally forbearing towards each other, studiously avoiding comparisons calculated to provoke invidious animosities. To this remark the letter of Mr. Clay furnishes an exception, expressing, as it does, doubts of the ability of either Webster or Scott, to discharge the duties of the Presidential office, with a wisdom and energy equal to those displayed by the present Administration.

All three substantially occupy the same position in relation to the Compromise and Fugitive Law, only that Gen. Scott not having been demonstrated by acts, or defined authoritatively by his own words, has enough uncertainty about it to give him the benefit of a doubt in the eyes of those Northern men, whose maxim is, to choose the least of evils. For this reason he is the favorite of the Northern Whigs, as Mr. Fillmore is of the Southern. Mr. Webster is not the first choice of either; but in the event of a fixed disagreement between the two sections, may slip into the candidate.

The fear that Mr. Fillmore might be utterly rejected by the Whigs of New York, is all that throws a cloud over the prospects of his nomination. Could the Convention persuade itself that he would have at least an equal chance with the Democratic candidate, of obtaining the vote of the State, it would nominate him.

With Fillmore or Webster for the standard-bearer, the Whig party come into the Presidential contest with a "platform." Their acts have not been done in a corner. No words could make their principles and policy better known than they are. The South could not but be made to feel that the North could not deceive itself in relation to them. The supporters of either would by that act demonstrate beyond a doubt their loyalty to the Compromise and Fugitive Law.

But Southern Whigs are anxious for success. Patronage has almost as many attractions for them as principle. They cannot shut their eyes to the fact that these, their special favorites, are of doubtful political standing at the North—that probably neither could command the full Whig strength of that section. What shall they do? Accept General Scott? The politicians would not hesitate, but could they rally the masses of the Southern Whigs in his support? And what to them is more important, could they maintain their own position at home, under such leadership? With Scott, undefined and unpledged, as Taylor was, never! But give them a platform satisfactory to the Slave Power, let the General plant himself on that, and they would be safe. Conceding Southern sentiment, however, they might direct their candidate of his strength in the North, and so lose all that induced them to accept him in the place of Fillmore or Webster.

Meantime, an attempt is to be made to satisfy the South, by indirect information, concerning Gen. Scott's opinions, which, it is hoped, may disarm the jealousy of one section without provoking the displeasure of the other. In Congress there are Southern men, who affirm positively the adherence of the General to the Compromise, and no Northern member denies it. There are Southern newspapers that do the same, and no Northern newspaper denies it. The most explicit testimony we have is that of a Washington correspondent of the *Nashville Banner*, which we copy from the *Baltimore Sun*:

Gen. Scott and the Compromise.—The *General's Position Defined*.—A Washington correspondent of the *Nashville Banner* recently had an interview with Gen. Scott, which, it is alleged, is indignant at the charge made in some of the newspapers that his position in regard to the Compromise measures is ambiguous. According to this writer, Gen. Scott, in his conversation with him, said:

"How can any one doubt my past or present support of the Compromise measures? Did I not, at the first meeting of the friends of the Union, held in Castle Garden, New York, publicly proclaim my approval of them?—at a period, too, when but a few in that city advocated the propriety of their adoption?—and immediately after my personal of Mr. Clay's first great speech in their defense, made in the Senate of the United States did not it follow that I was in the city of New York, and wrote to him in substance as follows:—

"I have in my day and generation, fought battles which have gained for our common

country some little renown and glory. These, however, might have been won by other men, or if lost, would have been repaired by the dominant chivalry of our brave soldiers. But the great battle which we are fighting involves the past—all that is dear and hopeful of the future. It is the battle of the preservation of the Union and the Constitution—the perpetuity of our republican institutions. I trust in God that you may be successful in your patriotic undertaking; for I most heartily approve of all the measures of your bill, and will give to it a cordial and energetic support!"

He also addressed a similar letter, it is said, to Mr. Webster, after reading his great speech. According to the writer, General Scott also remarked to him:

"Did not, during their discussion in Congress, personally exert my influence for their passage through both Houses? Besides, there is extant the most incontestable proof, that had the Compromise measures could not, by a vote of from five or ten, have passed the House of Representatives?"

Even the *Washington Union*, anxious as it is to throw doubt on the position of General Scott, does not question the credibility of this statement; and the *New York Tribune* admits that it has no reason to doubt that he was "an early, efficient, and most zealous supporter of the Compromise." In a late editorial, favoring the nomination of the General, it holds the following language:

"For, be it ever considered, we are not asking you to support a Higher Law candidate. Your organs are never weary of asserting that Gen. Scott was an early, efficient, and most zealous supporter of the Compromise, which we have no reason to deny."

Will there be any concessions to the South satisfy its requirements? Not at all. The National Convention will select either Fillmore or Webster; or, if constrained to take Scott, saddle him with the Compromise and Fugitive Law.

Suppose our prediction prove false—suppose Scott be nominated, without a platform, and that he should resolutely refuse to embarrass himself with any pledges; the Democratic candidate, on the contrary, being pledged openly, by his character, his declarations, and the action of the Democratic Convention to the Compromise and Fugitive Law—what would be the results? The loss of the Southern Whig vote, either by a junction with the Democratic, or by its being cast for another candidate. The concentration upon Scott of the entire Whig vote of the North, making a discount in some of our large cities for a few discontented Hungarians. The support of all those Anti-Slavery voters, of Whig affinities, who have for years past been accustomed to act with their party, only when it involved no conflict with their principles on the Slavery question. Such men as Mr. Campbell of Ohio, Messrs. Mann and Fowler, of Massachusetts, and others of similar views, would probably embrace such a standard-bearer. Anti-Slavery Democrats, accustomed to independent political action, might feel another Convention, and nominate a candidate of their own, who would draw his support from the Democratic ranks. If they did not do this, some would vote for Scott, some, for the Free Soil candidate, should one be in the field, some, stay at home. The Free Soil party would find it exceedingly difficult amidst such distracting events, to make headway with an independent nomination. The Democratic party might be defeated, and Scott be elected by the electoral vote of the North.

But suppose, as no intelligent observer, it seems to us, can doubt, that the nominee of the Whig National Convention be Mr. Fillmore, or Mr. Webster, or General Scott, on the platform of the Compromise and the Fugitive Law, what then may we expect? The Whigs of the South would remain united, and increase their vote. The Whigs of the North, as a party, would sustain the nomination. Of this there can be no doubt. Where is there a leading Whig journal or politician at the North, who has not, as a matter of course, a nomination, should it be made? The Whig State Conventions in the free States have abstained from any expression of hostility to the Compromise, and have announced their determination to support the nominees of the National Convention, whoever they might be. In Congress, Southern Whigs have insisted upon the disqualification for the Presidency of any man not committed to the Compromise, and no Northern Whig has rebuked such proscription. A regular caucus of the Whig members of the House, as a preliminary to the business of organization, adopted the Compromise and Fugitive Law, as a part of the basis of party action, and only two or three Whig members seceded; while not one in either branch of Congress has since then entered a formal protest against the proceedings, if we may except Messrs. Campbell and Fowler. Mr. Seward, a man looked up to by the anti-slavery Whigs of New York, has been silent the whole of this session, intimating no intention to resist the incorporation of the pro-slavery test in the party creed. That he will oppose it, the Unionist has no doubt; but he is not the unionist of the party on the point of extreme opposition, nobody who understands the theory of political action as held by Mr. Seward, believes that there is not the slightest ground for supposing that he is not to be guided by the action and nominations of the National Whig Convention, whatever they may be.

Then take the New York *Tribune*, the organ pre-eminently of the anti-slavery portion of the Whig Party; it has frankly avowed its purpose to support either Mr. Fillmore or Mr. Webster, should either be the choice of the Convention. Nay, more than this—the editor, in his paper of March 20th, goes into an argument to show that "New York is not opposed to Mr. Fillmore because of his approval of the Compromise measures." He says:

"If that were the difficulty, it would be far from formidable. There are very many of our citizens who do not approve the measures, and who especially do not approve the Fugitive Slave Law as a wanton, useless, galling outrage on the Free Spirit and humane instincts of the North. Yet the great mass of those who thus regard that law are so aware that the Constitution arms the slave-hunter with certain powers—that the whole subject is beset with difficulties—and they have never attempted to make acquiescence in or hostility to the Fugitive Slave Law a test of political orthodoxy. At our two State Elections, which have transpired since the Compromise measures were passed, Whig friends of those measures were elected by a large majority, and to important State offices by the votes of Whigs personally adverse to the measures—and so on the other side. The exceptions to this rule have been few and local. Mr. Ulman, a warm, open, leading Compromise Whig, was supported by a large majority of anti-slavery Whigs in the State, and we presume would be again."

There is a revelation for you. The Whigs of New York are not hostile to Mr. Fillmore because he approves of the Compromise and Fugitive Law. Not on the ground of any Principle do they oppose him. What, then, is the reason of their opposition? Listen:

"Why, then, is Mr. Fillmore obnoxious to a large majority of the Whigs of our State? We answer—Because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause. We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause. We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause."

"We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause. We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause."

"We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause. We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause."

"We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause. We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause."

"We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause. We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause."

"We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause. We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause."

"We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause. We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause."

"We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause. We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause."

"We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause. We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause."

"We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause. We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause."

"We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause. We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause."

"We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause. We say, because he has seen fit to prescribe and ostracize many of the most efficient and beloved Whigs in the State, on account of their alleged sympathy with the anti-slavery cause."

particularly the Fugitive Law and Compromise, do not oppose Mr. Fillmore because he is their antagonist in Principle, but because he does not give them a fair share of the leaves and fishes! This is the *Tribune's* representation, not ours. Now, what does this mean? "Mr. Fillmore, Mr. Webster, or whoever you may be, give us Whigs of a certain stripe, a fair chance at the office, and you shall have our votes, no matter what you believe, even though you hold the doctrines of devils!"

The editor, in another part of the same article, avows his own purpose, and the reason thereof, as follows:

"If the States which can vote for no Whig candidate shall, under the vicious machinery of a National Convention, insist effectually on putting Mr. Fillmore upon us for another term, we will support him. For, while we cannot oppose his prospective and irritating course on the Compromise question, we do not hope for any practical alternative but a candidate equally objectionable on that head, and who would uphold those vital principles of Public Policy—Protection, River and Harbor Improvement, &c.—wherein we heartily agree with Mr. Fillmore. We expect hereafter, as heretofore, to give our vote and efforts, whatever we may deem them, to the man who, in our judgment, is best calculated to our judgment as likely, if chosen, to do the most good attainable."

Thus speaks the leading anti-slavery editor of the Whig Party.

In view of the facts mentioned, have we not sufficient ground for the prediction, that no matter what the action and nominations of the National Whig Convention, the Whigs of the North will vote for the man who is in this the ground that all Whig anti-slavery men intend to occupy? What say those gentlemen in Congress who have hitherto so bravely stood by the cause of Human Rights? Are Messrs. Stevens, Howe, Allison, Mann, Fowler, Souder, Campbell, Newton, Welch, Sackett, Schoolcraft, Walbridge, prepared to adopt the policy of Mr. Seward and the New York *Tribune*? If not, what do they intend to do? That is a question which thousands of voters, indisposed to follow the lead of the New York *Tribune* and the famous Whig caucus, would like to hear answered. Slaveholding members rise in their places, explicitly state their demands, announce distinctly what they will, and what they will not do; but thus far we have heard but two members from the North who, in behalf of themselves and their constituents, have announced distinctly their purpose. We mean, Messrs. Townsend and Giddings. How much longer is this Northern reserve to be kept up?

The active opposition which Kosuth, his mission, and the cause of Freedom as represented by Hungary, have encountered from the Catholics of this country, especially the naturalized Irish and the Priests, has opened the eyes of many to the inherent repugnance between Democracy and Papal Authority.

Until lately, the Catholic priesthood and press had made no decided political demonstration. Their dogmas concerning the supremacy of the Church, and the universal authority of the Spiritual Power having been confined to their religious fellowship, excited no uneasiness, no comment. So long as those of our countrymen who chose to trust the priest with the keeping of their consciences retained their independence in civil and political affairs, it was scarcely a matter of public concern. But when their religious notions began to assume a political form, when their press and priesthood announced doctrines hostile to the Democratic Principle, arrayed themselves on the side of Despotism, and succeeded in repressing the generous sympathies of the laity, their position and pretensions became a fair subject for political discussion.

In England, Kosuth was received with enthusiasm by all classes except the Catholics. The Irish people generally manifested the greatest coldness towards him. In America he was met by the open denunciations of Bishop Hughes, and of all the Catholic journals throughout the Union; and our Irish Catholics, by their flaming hatred of Tyranny, manifested bitter animosity against this refugee from Austrian Despotism—a fact which reveals their deplorable vassalage to priestly authority. They have not been content with a simple expression of disapprobation, but have followed him up with the most unscrupulous assaults upon his reputation, upon the cause of Hungary, upon the revolutionary movements in Europe generally; and they have boldly enlisted in the defence of Austrian, French, and Russian Despotism. The Pope has been justified in his war not only upon the liberties of his subjects, but against the rights of Protestants in Catholic countries. Louis Napoleon has been pronounced an agent from Heaven, and his usurpation a blessing. Austria has been extolled as the pillar of order, the bulwark against Anarchy and Red Republicanism.

In opposing Democracy, they have nearly as much to do as the anti-slavery cause. Certainly they are marvelously astonished to hear in America that stands up for Despotism, cannot be loyal to this country. Having learned to despise its institutions, it may be expected to defend its character. The New York *Tribune*, after having endorsed Radetzky, Haynau, Nicholas, &c., adds:

"Another journal, *Die Katholische Kirchenzeitung*, which bears upon its face the declaration that it is published with the approbation of Archbishop Hughes and other eminent prelates, discourses as follows:—

"Austria is a small, insignificant spot on the map, compared with the gigantic greatness of America," says Daniel Webster. Yes, on the map, it is the fact. But in the reality, it is not so. Austria is, in reality, a giant; vast as it is on the map, is but a small spot in the vastness of its military power. Daniel Webster proposes to make war by sea and land! In what does the greatness of America consist? 1. In the tremendous extent of its forests and swamps. 2. In the terribly immense territory of its military power, which resembles the desert expanse of the ocean, where he who has seen one thing has seen everything. 3. In the gigantic stupidity of its conceit and wind-baginess. 4. In the tremendous greatness of its humbug; only simple children and ignorant fools allow themselves to be humbugged. But the true greatness of America, how is it with that? It is humbug."

Not to mere declamation is their hostility to Democracy to be confined. They are organizing, it would appear, to obtain the control of the ballot-box. We copy the following statement from the *Cincinnati Nonpareil*:

"Stardling Movements.—Our readers will recollect an article which we gave a few days ago from the *Louisville Democrat*, wherein it was stated that an organization of a body of Roman Catholics in Indiana had determined to oppose any man for public office who had favored the cause of Kosuth. The *Times* of last evening says a letter has been received by a gentleman of this city recently from a friend in Indiana, which states that very many Anti-slavery Whigs, who are known to be by the *Louisville Democrat*, and copied by us, exist, and are being formed all over that State, by the suggestion and advice of J. B. Purcell, Archbishop of Cincinnati."

It is also stated as a fact beyond question, that there was a popular meeting on Tuesday evening last, in the basement of the Cathedral of this city, of Irish and American Catholics, to vote upon the question of whether they would support any man for public office who had favored the cause of Kosuth. It was decided by a large majority that they would support no such man, who sympathized with Kosuth and his cause.

"Another circumstance of considerable weight as to corroborate the stories of active organizations among the Catholics, destined for political effect. Judge Warden has just resigned his seat on the bench, to which he was elected last October, and rumor says he is to take the editorial charge of a political paper in this city. Of this maneuvering we shall endeavor to keep our readers advised, while we meet the press, free and American."

This does not surprise us. Kosuth is regarded by the Irish Catholics here, as he is in Ireland. Richard D. Webb, the able Dublin correspondent of the *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, says:

"In Ireland, the enthusiasm on his behalf has been too feebly manifested, chiefly because he is the sworn enemy of despotic Austria, and despotic Austria is the main stay of the Papacy. The subjugation of Hungary has been followed by the persecution of the Protestants and the ascendancy of the Jesuits in that country; and as Kosuth has mentioned this fact in his speeches, he is denounced as a bigot by the Roman priests, who abhor freedom of conscience, and who desire that all men who dare to complain of being denied its exercise. The character of the reigning American statesmen, and the sympathy with despotism inseparable from the principles and interests of the Roman priesthood, (in America as well as everywhere else), fully account for any calumnies that may have been circulated against Kosuth. The Dublin papers in their interest (one in particular, the *Freeman's Journal*) have done all they could to depict him as a bigoted and a rebel, and declaring that the condition of Hungary under Austria was superior to that of Ireland under England."

The political movement against intervention, originated by the Catholic priests solely on religious grounds, is, we fear, but the beginning of a more powerful and more extensive movement in the field of American politics. The power it has been able to wield in uniting the Catholics as a body against Kosuth and his mission, and in the defence of Austria, will embolden it to further manifestations. With so large a body of voters obeying implicitly its bidding, it will be able, by adroit management, should the political world continue to be engorged with the questions and schemes which now agitate it, to acquire a fearful ascendancy. Certainly, with its enormous pretensions, it cannot remain willingly subordinate to the Civil Power, without treason to itself. Claiming absolute supremacy in all the relations of men, it is bound by the law of its being to assert the claim, whenever it can make it good, or pave the way for its recognition. Some of its supporters consider it premature now to urge its pretensions in all their length and breadth; but others are more audacious. Listen to Brownson, a man whose anti-republican lectures in St. Louis and Cincinnati have lately been heartily endorsed by the Catholic journals of the West:

"The only true policy, the only true wisdom in times such as this, is to stand firm, and to calmly and unflinchingly resist the claims of the spiritual order, and the universal supremacy of the spiritual order. The salvation of the world, in more senses than one, depends on the Holy See, and on a loyal submission and rigid obedience to all things which the successor of St. Peter. We confess, then, that we are grieved to see distinguished Catholic statesmen searching history for examples of resistance to the Papal authority by the temporal power, and concluding from them that a man may be a Catholic and also loyal to his temporal sovereign. Let us, in God's name, have no more of this. Let us dare to assert the truth, in the face of the lying world, and, instead of pleading for our church at the bar of the State, let us stand up to plead at the bar of the church, its divinely constituted judge. The State may have become enraged, may confiscate our goods, prohibit our worship, and shut up our churches, and religious houses, imprisonment, exile, or massacre us; but what then? Such things have been, but they have never been able, so long as Catholics retained their fervor, to injure the church or retard her progress. These things are powerless against us, only where our faith is weak, and our love waxed cold. Who has God on his side has no occasion to fear men or devils."

"That is the true doctrine of the Papacy—the universal supremacy of the spiritual order;—a loyal submission and rigid obedience to ALL THINGS to the successor of St. Peter! The church, supreme over the State! The Pope, the master of the Pope in the United States, by leading Catholics, sustained by Catholic journals, asserted to us, so far as we can see, by our Catholic citizens. What is there in a spiritual order holding such a doctrine, animated by such a spirit, to restrain it from the attempt to usurp supremacy in politics? These political organizations against European Freedom are but incipient steps to more comprehensive and formidable combinations. What may be expected should its universal supremacy in this country become realized, may be inferred from the following declaration of an out-spoken Catholic, in the *Rambler*, (1st July, 1851), one of the leading Catholic organs of England:

"As the most ultra-tolerant of talkers have no true belief in their own professions, so they never give Catholics credit for sincerity when they fall with the fashionable phraseology of the day, and protest that they would tolerate every man's creed to the fullest extent. Certainly they are marvelously astonished to hear in America that stands up for Despotism, cannot be loyal to this country. Having learned to despise its institutions, it may be expected to defend its character. The New York *Tribune*, after having endorsed Radetzky, Haynau, Nicholas, &c., adds:

"Another journal, *Die Katholische Kirchenzeitung*, which bears upon its face the declaration that it is published with the approbation of Archbishop Hughes and other eminent prelates, discourses as follows:—

"Austria is a small, insignificant spot on the map, compared with the gigantic greatness of America," says Daniel Webster. Yes, on the map, it is the fact. But in the reality, it is not so. Austria is, in reality, a giant; vast as it is on the map, is but a small spot in the vastness of its military power. Daniel Webster proposes to make war by sea and land! In what does the greatness of America consist? 1. In the tremendous extent of its forests and swamps. 2. In the terribly immense territory of its military power, which resembles the desert expanse of the ocean, where he who has seen one thing has seen everything. 3. In the gigantic stupidity of its conceit and wind-baginess. 4. In the tremendous greatness of its humbug; only simple children and ignorant fools allow themselves to be humbugged. But the true greatness of America, how is it with that? It is humbug."

Not to mere declamation is their hostility to Democracy to be confined. They are organizing, it would appear, to obtain the control of the ballot-box. We copy the following statement from the *Cincinnati Nonpareil*:

"Stardling Movements.—Our readers will recollect an article which we gave a few days ago from the *Louisville Democrat*, wherein it was stated that an organization of a body of Roman Catholics in Indiana had determined to oppose any man for public office who had favored the cause of Kosuth. The *Times</*

